DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 903 CE 000 130

AUTHOR	Swank, Chester E.
TITLE	FY 71 Resource Utilization: Low Income Programs; Contacts Made by Minority Groups.
INSTITUTION	Extension Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 May 72
NOTE	14p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	American Indians; Disadvantaged Groups; Extension Education; *Low Income Groups; Man Days; *Minority Groups; Negroes; *Program Evaluation; Spanish Americans
IDENTIFIERS	*Extension Service

ABSTRACT

Three summaries of extension service resource utilization by low income and minority groups during fiscal year 1971 are included, with interpretative observations. The first deals with the relationship between general and low income programs in terms of resources expended in areas of agriculture, home economics, 4-H youth, and community resource development. The second compares the areas in which members of minority groups (Negroes, American Indians, and Spanish Americans) were contacted by extension workers. The third summary deals with the relationship between contacts made per man day expended, comparing general and low income programs. The data used were obtained from report 71032 and replaces a previous summary dated May 1, 1972. (MS)

ED 081903

AC

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
EXTENSION SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

Cooperating with Land Grant Colleges and Universities

MAY 30 1972

SUBJECT: FY 71 Resource Utilization
- Low Income Programs
- Contacts made by Minority Groups

TO: C. A. Williams
Deputy Administrator
Program and Staff Development

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A summary has been prepared of the use of Extension resources during FY 71 in relation to:

1. Relationship between general and low income programs in terms of mandays expended.

2. Contacts made with minority groups (Negro, American Indian, Spanish American) by Extension professionals and their relationship to low income programs.

The first summary (Attachments 1 & 2) deals with the relationship between general (regular) and low income programs in terms of resources expended.

The second summary (Attachments 3 & 4) deals with the manner in which members of minority groups were contacted by Extension professionals and whether these contacts involved general or low income programs.

The third summary (Attachment 5) deals with the relationship between contacts made per manday expended, comparing general and low income programs.

The data used for these summaries were obtained from report 71032 and the following should be kept in mind:

1. Puerto Rico is not included.

2. Only "Program" data was included. That is, International, Staff Development, Program Leadership, Administration & Support and Leave were excluded from consideration.

3. Only professional staff were considered.

4. No contacts are included for Alabama and Mississippi.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CE000130

FY 71 Resource Utilization

We believe this data would be interesting for the Administrator to review and implies some implications for the CESS staff in their role of providing program leadership, in conducting program and comprehensive reviews and in reviewing their commitment to disadvantaged, minority and low income clientele.

This replaces a previous summary of this type dated May 1, 1972, which was discussed at the Administrative Council meeting on May 8, 1972.

At Mr. Kirby's request we are preparing a version of this data for distribution to State Extension Directors.

Chet

CHESTER E. SWANK, Director
Program Analysis and Evaluation

Attachments

OBSERVATIONS

1. The attached summary (Attachment 1) indicates the amount of Extension resources which were expended for General and Low Income programs (13.66%).

   a. Low Income is defined as "programs designed for or specifically related to clientele with Low Income".

2. The data indicates that overall, Extension has done relatively little in designing programs for or relating them specifically to Low Income clientele.

   a. The Home Economics area has done the best, primarily because of the EFNEP program.

   b. In other areas the proportion of Low Income work on a total program basis is:

(1)	Agriculture - Overall	2.179
(2)	Family Living	2.161
(3)	4-H Youth	3.464
(4)	CRD	.706

   c. Some program leaders will maintain that programs for low income clientele are not designed specifically for this group. At least in some cases this is debatable. Further, "regular" programs which are offered to low income clientele can be reported as relating to low income, however it does not appear that it is being done.

3. When the areas are reviewed by their particular components the amount of low income work is still relatively low, with the exception of Food & Nutrition. This breakdown is included in Attachment 2.

4. With our professed emphasis on serving low income, alienated and disadvantaged clientele, at least those with low income we are doing very little.

   a. What actions are necessary by ES Program Units to insure that programs for low income are being reported correctly?

      (1) Should this be a consideration when conducting Program Reviews?

      (2) What other actions should be taken?

b. What actions are necessary by ES Program Units to increase the proportion of programs that deal with low income clientele?

c. Do we (ES) have a clear understanding of what constitutes low income clientele? Does our interpretation coincide with the understandings and viewpoints of the states?

5. Although EMIS and SEMIS were not designed to identify the "touching" of all low income clientele (except by programs designed for or specifically related to them), it would seem appropriate that more effort must be made to identify, plan and report those programs (activities) which are related to (delivered to) this type of clientele.

ATTACHMENT 1

EXTENSION RESOURCES EXPENDED - FY 71
BY MAJOR PROGRAM CATEGORY
PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Agriculture

	General		Low Income		Total	
	Mandays	% of Total	Mandays	% of Total	Mandays	% of Total
Improving Farm Income	803669	29.37	47787	1.75	857457	31.11
Soil & Water Conservation	30774	1.12	794	.03	31569	1.15
Marketing	108141	3.95	7070	.26	115211	4.21
Pesticide Education & Emergency Preparedness	20388	.74	955	.03	21343	.78
Recreation Wildlife & Natural Beauty	30886	1.13	658	.02	31544	1.15
Forestry Production & Marketing	26475	.97	1474	.05	27949	1.02
Resource Protection & Environmental Improvement	29020	1.06	919	.03	29940	1.09
TOTAL	1049353	38.34	59657	2.18	1109013	40.52

EXTENSION RESOURCES EXPENDED - FY 71
BY MAJOR PROGRAM CATEGORY
PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Home Economics	General		Low Income		Total	
	Mandays	% of Total	Mandays	% of Total	Mandays	% of Total
Food & Nutrition	75970	2.78	140856	5.15	216826	7.92
Family Living	287668	10.57	59151	2.16	346820	12.67
TOTAL	363638	13.29	200007	7.31	563646	20.59
4-H Youth	776948	28.39	94812	3.46	871761	31.85
Community Resource Development	173032	6.32	19336	.71	192369	7.03
GRAND TOTAL	2362971	86.34	373812	13.66	2736789	100.00

ATTACHMENT 2

PROPORTION OF LOW INCOME WORK
BY MAJOR PROGRAM AREA
FY 71 - EXPENDITURE OF MANDAYS

AGRICULTURE

COMPONENTS	% OF THIS COMPONENT	% OF TOTAL AREA (Agriculture)	% OF TOTAL CESS PROGRAM
Improving Farm Income	5.612	4.308	1.746
Soil & Water Conservation	2.515	.071	.029
Marketing	6.136	.637	.258
Pesticide Education & Emergency Preparedness	4.474	.086	.034
Recreation, Wildlife & Natural Beauty	2.085	.059	.024
Forestry Production & Marketing	5.273	1.32	.053
Resource Protection & Environmental Improvement	3.069	.082	.033
TOTAL		5.375	2.177

HOME ECONOMICS

COMPONENTS	% OF THIS COMPONENT	% OF TOTAL AREA (Home Economics)	% OF TOTAL CESS PROGRAM
Food & Nutrition	64.962	24.990	5.146
Family Living	17.055	10.494	2.161
TOTAL		35.484	7.307

PROPORTION OF LOW INCOME WORK
BY MAJOR PROGRAM AREA
FY 71 - EXPENDITURE OF MANDAYS

4-H YOUTH

COMPONENTS	% of THIS COMPONENT	% OF TOTAL AREA (4-H YOUTH)	% OF TOTAL CESS PROGRAM
4-H Youth	10.875	-	3.464

CRD

COMPONENTS	% OF THIS COMPONENT	% OF TOTAL AREA - (CRD)	% OF TOTAL CESS PROGRAM
CRD	10.051	-	.706

CONTACTS BY MINORITY GROUPS WITH
EXTENSION PROGRAMS - FY 71

1. Based upon the assumption that the majority of minority groups contacted by Extension Professionals during FY 71 were in the low income category, an analysis has been made of these contacts.

2. Attachment 3 outlines the percentage of contacts with minority groups as a percentage of all contacts made with all groups. These data indicate:

   a. Contacts with minority groups in all program areas is relatively low.

   b. Negroes have the lowest proportion of contacts by Agriculture than any other Extension program area. The same is true of American Indians and Spanish Americans.

   c. Negroes have the largest proportion of contacts by the Home Economics program, primarily because of the EFNEP program.

3. Attachment 4 relates the contact relationship (general and low income) with Extension programs within the small proportion of contacts indicated in Attachment 3. This data presents some interesting relationships:

   a. The majority of contacts by Negroes has been involved with general programs rather than low income programs. The exception is Home Economics. The same is true of American Indians and Spanish Americans.

ATTACHMENT 3

CONTACTS MADE WITH MINORITY GROUPS BY EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS
DURING FY 71

AREA	TOTAL # OF CONTACTS	% CAUCASIAN & OTHER	% NEGRO	% AMERICAN INDIAN	% SPANISH AMERICAN	3 GROUP %
Total CESS Program	90,169,844	90.993	7.261	.625	1.121	9.007
Agriculture	27,628,954	95.070	3.789	.439	.702	4.930
Home Economics	16,568,350	86.790	10.274	.964	1.972	13.210
4-H Youth	40,270,828	89.791	8.468	.614	1.127	10.209
CRD	5,701,702	91.321	6.810	.835	1.034	8.679

CONTACTS MADE WITH MINORITY GROUPS BY EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS
FY 71
Relationship to General & Low Income Programs

NEGROES

AREA	CONTACTS % NEGRO	% GENERAL	% LOW INCOME
Total CESS Program	7.261	65.008	34.992
Agriculture	3.789	77.598	22.401
Home Economics	10.274	42.267	57.732
4-H Youth	8.468	72.480	27.519
CRD	6.810	65.136	34.863

AMERICAN INDIANS

	% AMERICAN INDIANS		
Total CESS Program	.625	53.609	46.387
Agriculture	.439	69.386	30.613
Home Economics	.964	31.745	68.249
4-H Youth	.614	61.568	38.431
CRD	.835	47.499	52.500

SPANISH AMERICANS

	% SPANISH AMERICANS		
Total CESS Program	1.121	64.288	35.711
Agriculture	.702	87.452	12.547
Home Economics	1.972	36.920	63.079
4-H Youth	1.127	72.020	27.979
CRD	1.034	83.080	16.919

OBSERVATIONS

1. The three minority groups discussed accounted for 9.007 of the contacts by Extension programs. This seems to be a low percentage in terms of the interest of Extension in programs for low income and minority groups. Agriculture program proportion was only 4.93% with these groups.

   a. What actions are necessary to develop and offer programs which will attract more members of minority groups? What actions should program units take in providing National leadership in this regard?

2. Within the contacts made with minority groups most of the contacts have been in Extension's general program.

   a. What actions are necessary to increase the contacts with minority groups involving those individuals with low income?

3. Contacts with Extension programs continues to be largely with Caucasians who are not low income.

ATTACHMENT 5

NUMBER OF CONTACTS
PER MANDAY EXPENDED
FY 71

AREA	GENERAL	LOW INCOME
Total CESS Program	34.583	22.606
Agriculture	25.127	21.142
Home Economics	35.853	17.653
4-H Youth	47.812	32.936
CRD	29.854	27.716

LOW INCOME PROGRAMS
RANKED FROM HIGH TO LOW

	GENERAL	LOW INCOME	RATIO LOW INCOME TO GENERAL
Agriculture-Forestry Production & Marketing	16.673	20.520	.812
Agriculture-Marketing	34.904	36.163	.965
CRD	29.854	27.716	1.07
Agriculture-Improving Farm Income	23.929	19.136	1.250
Agriculture-Pesticide Education & Emergency Preparedness	24.775	18.582	1.333
Agriculture-Soil & Water Conservation	25.662	18.700	1.372
Agriculture-Resource Protection & Environmental Improvement	27.237	19.427	1.402
4-H Youth	47.812	32.936	1.45
Agriculture-Recreation, Wildlife & Natural Beauty	27.040	15.852	1.705
Family Living	35.595	19.068	1.866
Food & Nutrition	36.827	17.058	2.158

OBSERVATIONS

1. Given the relatively small amount of low income work being performed the ratio of contacts between Extension's low income and general programs per manday expended run at a rate of from .812 to 2.158 times greater than for contacts with general programs.

   a. This means we generally work more efficiently (in terms of contacts per manday) with clientele in general programs than in low income programs. It is recognized that work with low income clientele generally requires a more individualized approach thus causing a low contact per manday expended.

   b. It would seem appropriate for the CESS to review the approaches used in general programs to determine where and how improvements can be made in low income programs to increase our effectiveness.

      (1) For example we do better in contacts with low income programs in Forestry Production/Marketing and Marketing than we do with general programs in these areas.

2. An increase in the amount of low income work and contacts made by minority groups therewith would improve this situation.

ERIC Clearinghouse
SEP4 1973
on Adult Education